



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE LATIN CONCORDANCE OF DANTE AND THE
GENUINENESS OF CERTAIN OF HIS
LATIN WORKS

Recent scholarship is surely tending to the view that *Epistola* x and the *Quaestio de Aqua et Terra* are genuine works of Dante. I need not repeat the arguments set forth by Moore, Shadwell, White, Boffito, Biagi, and others; I wish to confirm them, so far as may be, by an appeal to the Concordance of Dante's Latin works which Dr. Wilkins and I are about to publish. Further, I should like to show that the evidence there accessible fits better with the theory that the *De Vulgari Eloquentia* (= *V.E.*), *Epistola* x (= *Ep.* x), *Quaestio de Aqua et Terra* (= *A.T.*), *De Monarchia* (= *M.*), were written in the order indicated than in any other order. On different grounds, other scholars have reached the same conclusion. For instance, — I am attempting no elaborate bibliography here, — Wicksteed and Howell¹ assign *V.E.* to the year 1304; *Ep.* x is placed by different scholars between the years 1316 and 1319;² *A.T.* must have been written shortly after the subject of the treatise was discussed by the author at Verona, January 20, 1320, which date the work itself gives us. The date of *M.* is the most mooted of all. Some put it fairly early, as Wicksteed and Howell³ who decide tentatively for 1309, but others⁴ regard it as a work of the last years of Dante's life (1318–1321). One bit of evidence on which the last-named theory depends may be corroborated, I believe, by the Concordance.

¹ *A Translation of the Latin Works of Dante*, 1904, p. 119. See also Paget Toynbee, *A Dictionary of Proper Names and Notable Matter in the Works of Dante*, Oxford, 1898, p. 214.

² See Moore, *Studies in Dante*, Third Series, 1903, p. 345.

³ *Op. cit.* p. 289.

⁴ See Scartazzini, *Enciclopedia dantesca*, 1898–1899, vol. ii, p. 1268, and also various references in Pasquale Villari, *Il "De Monarchia" di Dante Alighieri in Nuova Antologia*, vol. xlvi (1911), pp. 393 ff. Villari himself thinks books i and ii were written in 1300 and book iii after 1308. There is no support for this theory in the evidence which I offer in the present article.

In *M.* i. 12. 42, Dante apparently makes a direct reference to the *Paradiso*. He remarks:

Hoc viso, iterum manifestum esse potest, quod haec libertas, sive principium hoc totius libertatis nostrae, est maximum donum humanae naturae a Deo collatum, *sicut in Paradiso Comediae iam dixi*; quia per ipsum hic felicitamur, ut homines, per ipsum alibi felicitamur, ut Dii.

So read Witte's manuscripts, save that in two of them — P (saec. XIV) and F (saec. XV) — lacunæ are indicated, showing apparently that part of the reference to the *Paradiso* was erased, either by the writers of these manuscripts or, perhaps, by those of their originals. F has *sicut in . . . quia*; P has *sicut . . . commedie iam dixi, quia*.

Now Marsilio Ficino in his translation of 1467 has nothing at all for the phrase *sicut . . . dixi*, and the early editions, of which the earliest appeared in 1559, have not the clause. Witte thinks that merely the words *sicut dixi* are genuine, and he is followed by Moore. The real reference, Witte states, is not to the *Paradiso*, but to the beginning of this very chapter of the *Monarchia*, where Dante has declared *primum principium nostrae libertatis est libertas arbitrii*. But beyond the repetition of these words which state the proposition proved in the first part of the chapter, there is no reference to it in the later sentence. Nothing has been said before about "the greatest gift conferred by God on man," to which sentiment the *sicut dixi* applies. If now we turn to *Paradiso* v. 19 ff., we find an unmistakable connection.

Lo maggior don, che Dio per sua larghezza
Fesse creando, ed alla sua bontate
Più conformato, e quel ch' ei più apprezza,
Fu della volontà la libertate,
Di che le creature intelligenti
E tutte e sole furo e son dotate.

This much is cited by Witte. Perhaps we may go a bit further and see in the concluding clause of the Latin passage, *quia . . . alibi felicitamur, ut Dii*, an allusion to the last part of the same canto, where Beatrice and Dante come upon a thousand radiant beings replete with divine love, and Beatrice tells him to "Speak, speak securely and trust even as to *gods*." If Dante has not in mind this passage in the *Paradiso*, which is altogether apposite, his reference is most puzzling; for there is no other passage which is apposite, certainly none in *M.*

If Witte wanted to omit anything, he should have cast out the entire clause, *sicut . . . dixi*, as Ficino and the early editors did. But why did they? Not necessarily because prompted thereto by critical or hypercritical acumen. They both might well have had manuscripts in which some such mutilation had occurred as we find in F and P. Unable to make any meaning out of the remnant of the clause, they left it out entirely. That would be a critical procedure quite in keeping with the practice of those times. That the omission in the manuscripts was due to accident rather than hypercriticism is shown by its fragmentary nature. I submit, therefore, that it is incumbent upon us to accept this reference at its face value until it has been absolutely proved worthless. That, however, is not the case. I will not deny that the problem needs further investigation and that, in particular, the relation of the different manuscripts to one another should be fixed. As F and P seem clearly related elsewhere, I am tempted to trace their different mutilations of the *sicut . . . dixi* clause to an original mutilation, or obscurity, in their common archetype, from which the manuscripts used for the *editio princeps* and likewise for Ficino's translation descended. But, again, this part of the subject demands fresh treatment.

Meanwhile, let us appeal to the Concordance to see if there is any reason why Dante could not have said *sicut in Paradiso Comediae iam dixi*. We find, first of all, that he uses a *sicut* clause of this sort not infrequently in all the four works (*V.E.*, *Ep.* x, *A.T.*, *M.*), when referring to the works of another writer. Thus:

sicut dicit Thomas in tertio suo contra Gentiles (*M.* ii. 4. 5); *sicut dixit* Philosophus in secundo Metaphysicorum (*Ep.* x. 101).

Further, he uses the phrase in referring to his own works, or at least to the work in which the phrase appears:

Sicut inferius ostendimus (*V.E.* i. 8. 24); *sicut* inferius ostendimus (*V.E.* i. 12. 55); *sicut* dictum est (*V.E.* i. 14. 21); *sicut* in superioribus est peractum (*M.* iii. 2. 2).

Now I will not deny that an interpolator might notice this habit of Dante's and observe it in his own interpolation, or that, unconscious of Dante's usage, he might have happened to adopt it. But I am specially interested to note that the phrase is *sicut . . . dixi*, and not the plural, *sicut . . . diximus*. If it were the latter, there would be a distinct

probability that the words are spurious. How so, one may ask, when we have just observed the plural in two passages from the *V.E.*? The facts are as follows, and they may be seen in the Concordance under *nos*, *ego*, *noster*, and *meus*.

In *V.E.* the word *ego* occurs just once, and does not refer to Dante. He uses it in an illustration: *ut: Piget me cunctis pietate maiore*, etc. (*V.E.* ii. 6. 36). But Dante tells us about himself not infrequently in *V.E.* He uses for the purpose the plural *nos*, which occurs thirty-eight times. One of these instances is a quotation. In some of the others the word has a general sense, "we men in general," and sometimes includes both the author and his readers, whom he has invited to join him in an imaginary hunt for the *vulgare illustre*. But in about twenty cases it refers clearly to Dante himself. A specially good illustration is *Nos cui mundus est patria* (i. 6. 17), where the plural *nos* is followed by the singular relative. The same holds true for *noster*, while *meus* does not occur at all. The same holds true for *dico*, for which he always has *dicimus*. Other verbs in the first person are plural, though there may be an exception or two besides the rather striking one I have noticed:

Nec dubitandum *reor* modo in eo quod *diximus temporum*, sed potius *opinamur* tenendum (*V.E.* i. 9. 60).

Now in all his other works, — and I think that however their order be determined, few would object to calling them later than *V.E.*, — there is only *one* occurrence of this usage, i.e. *Ep.* x. 85:

Sed zelus gloriae vestrae, quam sitio, *nostrum* parvipendens ("But zeal for your glory [i.e. that of Can Grande], for which I thirst, recking little of *my own*.")

Nos and *noster* occur elsewhere in *Ep.* x, *A.T.*, and *M.*, but always in the general, never in the special, sense. Thus:

Hoc etiam est insinuatum *nobis* in Matthaeo ("We are given to understand," *Ep.* x. 548); in die Solis . . . quem . . . Salvator . . . *nobis* innuit venerandum (*A.T.* 24. 19); licet ostensa sit *nobis* haec ab humana ratione, quae per philosophus *nobis* innotuit (*M.* iii. 16. 65, 66).

When Dante wishes to say "I" in his later works, he used *ego*, though that word and *meus* are used very rarely in all of them, apart from quotations, which of course do not concern us here. So though I have not proved that Dante must have written the *sicut . . . dixi* clause, I could at

least congratulate an interpolator on not having said *sicut . . . diximus*. Surely the burden of proof lies altogether on those who would expunge the words from the text, and as no real proof has appeared, we have a right to draw from the words the chronological inferences which they contain.

I will assume, then, that the *Monarchia* was written in Dante's later period, at least after the fifth canto of the *Paradiso* was written. Other scholars have placed it there on other grounds, particularly for various connections with the subject matter of the *Paradiso*; if it is put as late as this, nothing compels us to place it before rather than after *A.T.* I am inclined to place it after, for a reason that will later appear, and thus to regard it as the last of all Dante's works.

Supposing, then, as others have done, that *V.E.*, *Ep. x*, *A.T.*, and *M.* were written in the order in which I have named them, I will appeal to various stylistic peculiarities not to prove this order, but to show at least that it is plausible. Proof is impossible. An array of peculiarities common to *A.T.* and *M.* does not necessarily prove that the two treatises were written in the same period; these peculiarities may depend merely on the nature of the subject treated. But it is at least possible that similar habits of mind resulting in similar traits of expression were not far separated in point of time. I think I can show, that, granting the chronological order assumed by others, the various stylistic evidence makes for that order rather than any other; and whatever value this point of the discussion may have, I am confident that the material soon to be accessible in the Concordance will establish beyond cavil the weighty arguments already adduced for the genuineness of *Ep. x* and *A.T.*

One point deserves special emphasis at the outset. *A.T.* was first published by Moncetti in 1508; the manuscript which he professed to have used is not extant to-day. The author of the work both at the beginning and at the end declares himself as Dante. If the work is really spurious, we are concerned with a deliberate forgery, not merely a case of mistaken attribution on the part of either the original scribe or Moncetti. If, then, the work is a forgery, it is more probable that Moncetti is the guilty person than that in his innocence he happened to find what some one else had forged either in his own day or at some earlier period. I will not deny the possibility of such a circumstance, but it is extremely improbable. Our most natural dilemma is that *A.T.* is either the fiction of Moncetti or a genuine work of Dante.

The case is exactly the same with *Ep.* x. That was first published by Baruffaldi in 1700, but he surely did not invent it; it is found in its entirety in three manuscripts of the fifteenth century, and the introductory part (§§ 1-4) is found in two manuscripts of the fifteenth century. The first mention of the letter is probably that of Villani at the end of the fourteenth or beginning of the fifteenth century.¹ Now in the salutation of the letter the author purports to be Dante, and even granting that this salutation might be a later addition, a writer who gives an elaborate description of the third part of a poem of his which he calls *Cantica tertia Comoediae Dantis, quae dicitur Paradisus* (l. 257) evidently either is or assumes to be Dante. So, as with *A.T.*, the hypothesis of mistaken attribution must be ruled out at the start. Either this letter is a forgery by Villani or some other writer of the fourteenth century, or it is the authentic work of Dante.²

By "stylistic evidence" I mean not merely coincidence in noticeable phrases. For instance, in *M.* (i. 14. 78) we have the phrase *cum Deus velit quod melius est*, and in *A.T.* (13. 39) *cum Deus et natura semper faciat et velit quod melius est*, the combination *Deus et natura* occurring also in several places in *M.* A coincidence of this sort is interesting, but not a proof of authorship, since the phrase is just what an imitator, seeking to give his forgery verisimilitude, would notice. We must find, if possible, indubitable traits of a minor nature which no imitator could detect, and which therefore bespeak the genuineness of the work. Again, I will not say prove. Stylistics and statistics taken alone must be handled with the utmost caution. Added, however, to the other varieties of evidence in our problem, they come as near to certainty as human methods can. Approaches to an investigation of this sort have been given by Moore,³ and by Biagi in his recent and very elaborate edition of *A.T.* (1907), which he concludes with a word-index, apparently complete except for some of the minor words, giving parallel passages or phrases in the other works of Dante; in this undertaking he found the concordance of Fiammazzo valuable. The result shows, he declares, *la perfetta identità*

¹ For the above facts, see Boffito's edition, 1907, pp. 1 ff.

² I am neglecting, as I think I have a right to neglect in the present discussion, theories of a composite origin of *Ep.* x. See Moore, *Studies in Dante*, Third Series, pp. 347 ff.

³ *Studies in Dante*, Second Series, 1899, pp. 346 ff.; Third Series, pp. 324 ff.

lessicale e sintattica between *A.T.* and the other works. This perfect identity may be still more minutely shown.

I will treat the subject under two heads: 1, Dante's vocabulary; 2, his constructions. As a preliminary, we should note that the works under discussion differ in length, but that if we take for comparison not the entire *M.* or *V.E.*, but the books of these works, the units in question will be more nearly commensurable. Thus *M.* i has ten pages of Moore's edition; ii, ten and a half; iii, thirteen and a half; *V.E.* i, eleven and a half; ii, ten and a half; *Ep.* x, six and a half; *A.T.* eight. It will be seen that even when so considered we have smaller amounts of text in *Ep.* x and *A.T.* than in a book of *M.* or *V.E.* and hence should not expect so many instances of any given peculiarity. We have enough material for profitable investigation, however. The pages in Moore are closely printed. In the *editio princeps*, in which likewise no space is lost, *A.T.* takes up thirteen and a half pages. I will not always apportion my statistics to the different books, but the reader should keep these general proportions in mind.

Coming first to the vocabulary of the Latin works, we must remember above all that a genius like Dante is bound to vary his phraseology. If it were true that all the words in *A.T.* and *Ep.* x occurred elsewhere in Dante, that would indicate the spuriousness rather than the genuineness of those treatises. Let us begin by testing as specimens the Latin words, whatever their nature, that begin with A, and note those that are found only in some one of the different works. I do not consider here the Latin quotations in Dante's Italian works. The number of occurrences, if greater than one, is indicated in the parentheses after each word.

ECL. I

abscondo, adusque, alveolus, Aonius, astricola, attritus = 6.

ECL. II

acernus, Achaemenides, Acis, Adria, Aemilis, Aetna, Aetnaeus, Aetnicus, agrestis, Alphesiboeus, alumnus, ango, annosus (2), *aridus, arrideo, arundo, arundineus, arvum, avidus* = 19.

ECL. I AND II

anhelus (2), *armentum* (2). Total for *Ecl.* = 27.

M. I

abeo, abstractum, acceptabilior (2), *acceptabilissimus, actuo* (2), *acuo, adolescentia, aegroto, agibilis, agito, albedo, algor, amplior* (2), *analytice, ancillor, apprehendo* (2), *apprehensivus, Arago, aristocraticus, assequor* (2), *auxiliatio, Averrois* = 22.

M. II

abrumbo, Abydos, 'acerbe,' 'acies,' adoptio, 'adveho,' adversor, Aeacides, Aeneis (2), *'aes,' aestivus, 'aethereus,' Afri, Africa* (6), *Africanus* (2), *agon, agonista, Albanus* (3), *altrinsecus, 'amabilis,' amissio, Anchises, ancile* (2), *Andromache, anhelor, Antaeus* (2), *ante adv., approbo, aptus, arbiter, 'ardentior,' artificiose, Assaracus, assentio, Assyrius, 'asto,' Atalanta, athleta* (6), *athletizo* (3), *athlotheta, 'Atlantis,' 'auratus,' Ausonia, 'Ausonius,' avia, avus* (2) = 46.

M. III

abnego, absolute (3), *absumo, abundanter, abundantia, accidentalis, 'accuso,' acquiesco, adeptio, adhibeo, advoco* (3), *aequivalentia, aequivaleo* (4), *afficio, 'affluens,' Agatho, alienatio, alieno* (2), *altar, altercatio, annihilor, apostema, applico, archipresbyter, architectus, areola, Asianus, 'attexo,' auctorizo* (6), *audicio, 'azyma'* = 31.

M. I AND II

acquiror (7), *aestus* (2), *annexus* (2).

M. I AND III

activus (2), *ambitus* (7), *assimilo* (3), *aureus* (2).

M. II AND III

adiuvo (5), *artifex* (4). Total for M. = 108.

V.E. I

abmotim, accentuo, accola, acerbitas (2), *adiectio, adinvenio* (2), *admoveo, Aduaticus* (2), *adultus, advena* (2), *advenio, adverbium, aedificatio* (2), *aequator, aequo, aetas, affirmo* (4), *Alamania, Alamannus, Alexandria, allego, allubesco, alteratio, alterno, altriplex, Alvernia, ambages, amentia, amicabile, amoenior, amoveo, amussis, Anconitanus* (3), *Anglia, Anglicus* (2), *angulus* (2), *anterioritas, antiquior, apocopo, Apulia, Apulus* (5), *Aquileiensis* (2), *Aragonia, architector n., architector vb., argumentor* (2), *Arturus, aspiro, associo, assuefacio, assuefio, asylum, audacter, augustus, avidissimus, Azzo* = 56.

V.E. II

accensio, acutus, additio, admissio, aemulor, Aeneidorum (2), *aequalitas* (3), *allevio, alloquor, alterus, angelicus, animalis* (2), *antecedens* adj., *aporio, appendo, Aquinum, armonia* (2), *armonizo* (6), *Arnaldus* (5), *artificiatus, ascensus* (2), *asper, aspiratio, astripetus, aulice, austeritas* = 26.

V.E. I AND II

accentus (4), *amplissimus* (2), *anterior* (2), *Arctinus* (4), *arrogio* (2), *asiduitas* (2) = 6. Total for V.E. = 88.

EP. I

adiaceo, affectuosissimus, affluentia, Albus, attento = 5.

EP. II

alipes.

EP. III

abstineo, assiduus.

EP. IV

acceptus.

EP. V

'acceptabilis,' affectuosius, agellus, alba, almus, Alpes, amplexor, ancillor, animositas, anne, annuo, Argus, arrigo, assurgo (2), *attenuo* = 15.

EP. VI

advento, advolo, aedificium, altissime, amarissime, amens, antiquitas, Aprilis, aries, armo, arrogantia, atqui, augustalis, avolo = 14.

EP. VII

accumulo, Agag (2), *aggrego, Alcides, alimentum, allicio, Amalech* (3), *Amata, Amos, amplexus, amputatio, angustissimus, angustus, arbor, area, aresco, ascio, assevero, avello* = 19.

EP. VIII

abigo, abominabilis, abvium, accuratissime, aestimo, aeternitas, affigo, aggenero, Alcimus, Ambrosius, ara, aranea, arca (2, '1'), *aspergo* n., *astronomus, auriga* = 16.

EP. IX

absolutio, affectuose.

EP. X

absolutus, *accuratus*, *admirabilitas* (2), *allecturus*, *allegoria* (2), *allegoricus* (2), *alleon*, *A(lpha)*, *amicitia* (7, '1'), *amodo*, *anagogicus*, *analogia*, *analogus*, *angustia*, *Apollon* (3), *ascensio*, *attentio*, *attentus* (2), *attollo*, *auditor* (2) = 20.

A.T.

accessus, *adaequatio* (5), *adimitor*, *aequivoce* (2), *altior* (20), *antarcticus*, *Antepraedicamenta*, *apparentia*, *appensio*, *arcticus*, *astrologus*, *attractio*, *attraho* = 13.

The above list shows that *Ep.* x and *A.T.* agree with the accepted works in their use of a dozen words or more which occur nowhere else in Dante. The number of such words varies considerably in the different books of the accepted works; *Ep.* x in proportion to its size has more than *M.* i and less than *M.* ii. *A.T.* has a sufficient number, though less, as we might expect from the subject, than in any book of *V.E.* or *M.* The longer letters show a high proportion, but *Ep.* iv, most probably genuine, has in its page of text only one word not elsewhere used.

I now subjoin a list of words which illustrates Dante's general vocabulary and which shows that *Ep.* x and *A.T.* conform to the accepted works in the use of words and senses, whether frequent or rare, in Dante. I do not include everything here, but aim especially to show Dante's use of minor words and particles and his technical phraseology — his argumentative apparatus — though some words here registered do not come under this heading. Each word occurs in at least three of the four works and sometimes elsewhere. If a word occurs in *Ep.* x but not in *A.T.*, *Ep.* x is added in parenthesis; *A.T.* is added if the word occurs there but not in *Ep.* x; if no work is mentioned in parenthesis, the word occurs in both *Ep.* x and *A.T.* In a few cases, e.g. *amplius*, more exact statements are made. If the word is printed in italics, it occurs not more than five times in any of the works in which it appears. If it is in black roman type, it occurs from six to fifteen times in some one of the works; if in black italic type, sixteen to twenty-five times; if in capitals, over twenty-five times. "Arg." denotes a logical or argumentative term, "phil." a philosophical term.

Accedo (*Ep.* x), *accipio* (arg., *Ep.* x), *actus* (*A.T.*), *adduco* (arg., *Ep.* x), *adhuc* (arg., rare; frequent in St. Thomas Aquinas), *agens*, *ago* (arg. and phil.), *aliquis* (*Ep.* x; cf. *aliqua* *litter* *M.*, *V.E.*), *aliquando*, *amplius* (arg., rare; *M.*, *Epp.* iii, vi; frequent in St. Thomas Aquinas), *apparet* (arg.), *appello*,

argumentum, **asserō** (Ep. x), **coepio** (A.T.), **communiter**, **CONSEQUENS** (*per consequens* and *consequens est* in all four), **considero**, **deinde**, **denique**, **destructio** (arg.), **differentia** (A.T.), **e** (rare; generally in the phrase *e converso*, which occurs in all four works), **efficio** (A.T.), **elementum**, **eo quod**, **equidem** (A.T.), **evidentia** (only in the phrase *ad evidentiam*; cf. *evidens* M., *evidenter* M., V.E.), **existimo** (Ep. x), **exordium** (Ep. x), **extra**, **facilior** (Ep. x), **frustra** (A.T.), **gradus**, **huiusmodi**, **ibi**, **IDEM**, **ideo**, **immediate** (Ep. x; cf. *immediatus* M., V.E.), **immo**, **impossibilis**, **inferius** adv. (A.T.), **influo** (phil.), **innuo** (arg.), **inspicio** (arg.), **INTENDO**, **intra** (Ep. x), **intueor** (arg., A.T.), **invicem** (Ep. x), **ita** (rare), **magis**, **manifesto** vb., **materia**, **melius** adv. (Ep. x), **minus** (A.T.), **minus**, **MODUS** (*nullo modo* M., V.E., A.T.; *per modum* with genitive in all four works), **motor** (phil.), **motus**, **multo** (A.T.), **NATURA**, **naturalis**, **ne**, **NEC**, **neque** (very rare), **nihil**, **nil** (rarer than *nihil*; Ep. x), **nonne** (rather poetical, Ecl., M. ii, V.E., Epp. v, vi, vii, ix, x), **nonnullus** (Ep. x), **nosco** (Ep. x), **nunc** (arg.), **numquid**, **omitto** (arg.), **oppositum** (arg., A.T.), **OSTENDO**, **philosophia**, **philosophor** (A.T.), **plus** (very rare; Ep. x), **pono** (arg.), **POST** prep., **postquam** (rare; Ep. x), **potius**, **praefatus** (A.T.), **praemitto** (arg., Ep. x), **praenoto** (arg.), **praesens**, **praeter**, **praeterea** (rare; A.T.), **primo** (*primum* is very rare, see list for V.E. and M., p. 31), **principaliter** (Ep. x), **PRINCIPIUM**, **prior** (A.T.), **prius**, **procedo** (arg. and phil.), **propono** incl. *propositum* (arg.), **PROPRIUS**, *propterea* quod, **QUAERO**, *quaestio* (A.T.), **qualis** (rare), **quantitas**, **quantumcumque** (Ep. x), **quilibet**, **quidem** (Ep. x), **QUI QUIDEM**, **quin** (rare; M. but none in bk. i, V.E., Epp. v, vi, vii, viii), **quippe** (Ep. x), **quisquam** (rare; Ep. x), **quisque** (rare; Ep. x), **quo**, **quomodo** (rare; Ep. x), **quoniam** (rare; Ep. x), **RATIO**, **recipio** (arg. and phil.), **recte** (A.T.), **requiro**, **RES** (phil.), **respectus** (*per respectum ad* V.E., Ep. x, A.T.), **saltem** (A.T.), **satis**, **scientia**, **scio** (in two thirds of the instances, the gerundive *sciendum* is found; Ep. x and A.T. conform), **scribo** (introducing quotations), **secundo**, **semper**, **sensus**, **sermo**, **seu** (rare, see *sive*; Ep. x), **SICUT**, **significo** (Ep. x), **similis**, **similiter**, **similitudo**, **simplex** (cf. *simplicissimus* V.E., *simplicitas* M., V.E.), **simpliciter**, **simul**, **singulus** (A.T.), **SIVE** (cf. *seu*), **soleo** (A.T.), **species** (A.T.), **speculator** (Ep. x), **spiritualis** (Ep. x), **SUB**, **subiectum**, **substantia**, **subtiliter** (A.T.), **sufficiens** (A.T.; cf. *sufficiens* A.T., *sufficientia* M., V.E.), **sufficio**, **super** (rare; *super* = *de* is very rare), **superius**, **talis**, **tam** (rare, generally *tam . . . quam*), **tango** (arg.), **TANTUS**, **teneo** (arg.), **totaliter**, **tractatus**, **tum** (rare; A.T.), **tunc** (a bit more frequent than *tum*), **ubique**, **ulterius**, **universum**, **universus**, **unusquisque** (A.T.), **usque** (A.T.), **utrum** (A.T.), **VEL** (cf. *aut*), **vere** (A.T.), **VERITAS**, **verso** vb. (Ep. x), **VERO** (*verum* very rare; Ecl. ii, M. i, ii, Epp. vi, vii, x), **VERUS**, *via* "method" (arg., A.T.), **virtus** = *potentia* (phil.), **volo** (arg.).

Having shown sufficiently by testing Dante's Latin vocabulary that *Ep. x* and *A.T.* conform in this regard to accepted works, let me now refer

to various constructions in which they all manifest a striking similarity. I will begin with *si*.

Si occurs in each of the seven books between twenty and sixty times. The indicative is used in a simple condition, protasis and apodosis, in all the books. Conditions contrary to fact, with imperfect and pluperfect subjunctive, occur in all the works save *Ep.* x. A usage not common in classical Latin is that of the indicative in the apodosis and the present subjunctive in the protasis.¹ Thus:

si contingat peccatum in forma artis, materiae imputandum est (*M.* ii. 2. 22).

This present subjunctive is clearly not the less vivid future, but hortatory or concessive. The indicative of the apodosis is generally either future, or some form implying future time, like the gerundive. A favorite formula in *M.* is *si* with *considero*, e.g. *si enim consideremus unum hominem . . . videbimus* (*M.* i. 5. 22). This appears in *V.E.* also, which work and *Ep.* x have *inspicio* in the same sense. In *M.* the apodosis is almost always of the nature described. In *V.E.* and *Ep.* x the usage is somewhat freer, the present indicative appearing oftener than in *M.* instead of a tense implicitly future: e.g.

si quis autem quaerat . . . respondemus (*V.E.* i. 10. 40); *si inspiciamus . . . videtur* (*V.E.* i. 12. 15); *si ergo accipitur . . . manifestum est* (*Ep.* x, 364); *si essentia sit intellectiva, virtus tota est unius* (*Ep.* x, 395).

This construction explains the apparent abnormality of *A.T.* 12. 19:

Si igitur aqua erit in A, et habeat transitum . . . movebitur ad B.

The curious use of the future indicative *erit* with the present subjunctive *habeat* as a second member of the *si* clause is a comment on the meaning of this subjunctive, a proof that it is not less vivid future. Of the many occurrences of the present subjunctive in conditions, every one is most naturally explained as hortatory-concessive. Dante's substitute for the present subjunctive in less vivid future conditions is a lax use of the imperfect, as:

Et si quis instaret . . . inutilis est instantia (*M.* iii. 7. 23); *Quod si cuiquam . . . videretur indignum, Spiritum sanctum audiat* (*Ep.* x. 35); *Si igitur aqua moveretur ad B . . . movebuntur* (*A.T.* 12. 45).

What later forger could have penetrated so deeply into Dante's feeling about the conditional subjunctive? I may add that despite the brevity

¹ There are certain approaches in classical usage. See E. F. Claflin in *Classical Journal*, 1911, pp. 305-307.

of *Ep.* ii, which prevents any extensive application of stylistic evidence in its case, the sentence *si considerentur . . . lux . . . exoritur* (28), speaks for its genuineness.

In *V.N.* 7. 43 Dante quotes a sentence from the Vulgate in which *si* takes the indicative in an indirect question, and himself uses this lax construction in *V.E.* i. 4. 46, *recordetur si numquam dixit*, but not in his later works. A collocation likewise found in *V.E.*, but not later, is *puta si*.

In the compounds of *si*, the same principles are observed. *Ac si* and its equivalents take in classical Latin the present subjunctive in present time; it is the same hortatory-concessive subjunctive which in Dante's usage had spread to all clauses with *si*, and which in Boethius was well on its way to this development. In Dante these particles, which are very rare, take either the present or imperfect subjunctive, as in *M.* iii. 15. 34: *Quod non sic intelligendum est, ac si Christus . . . non sit dominus*; and just below: *Velut si aureum sigillum loqueretur*. *Ac si* appears in *Ep.* x, 504, and, though differing from the *ac si* clause just quoted from *M.*, shows that the writer understands Dante's real usage: *et similis modus arguendi est ac si dicerem*.

Nisi is most frequently used elliptically without a verb, as *quod esse non potest, nisi quando*, *M.* i. 8. 27, and is generally preceded by a negative. *Ep.* x and *A.T.* accord with the other works in this peculiarity. When *nisi* takes a verb, the same constructions are found as for *si*. Thus, to take examples of the hortatory-concessive subjunctive:

Sed hoc esse non potest . . . nisi sit voluntas una (*M.* i. 15. 56); *diesis esse non potest . . . nisi reiteratio unius odae fiat* (*V.E.* ii. 10. 31); *non potest esse concentrica terrae, nisi terra sit . . . gibbosa* (*A.T.* 13. 9).

Etsi is not used in *V.E.* and *A.T.* It appears in some of the letters, once in *Ep.* x with the present indicative in both clauses, and several times in *M.*, where either present indicative or present hortatory-concessive subjunctive is used. *Etiam si* occurs once in *V.E.*, with this same subjunctive, which is found likewise in two of the occurrences in *M.* Thus *Ep.* x and *A.T.* agree with the acceptedly genuine works not only in conforming to the constructions which Dante frequently employs in them, but in avoiding those which he avoids.

Another significant particle is *quod*, which occurs over four hundred and fifty times in all, the figures for the works in question being: fifty-eight

in *M.* i, fifty-four in ii, ninety-four in iii, fifty-eight in *V.E.* i, forty-two in ii, forty-five in *Ep.* x, seventy-four in *A.T.* A curious construction appears in *V.E.*, — *quod* with either indicative or subjunctive like *ut* of result. Thus: *angelus in illa, et diabolus in illo taliter operati sunt, quod ipsa animalia moverunt organa sua, V.E. i. 12. 47.* Other proleptic particles besides *taliter* in *V.E.* are *ita, adeo, tantus, in tantum.* The same peculiarity appears in *Ep.* x. 528: *intellectus in tantum profundat se in ipsum desiderium suum . . . quod memoria sequi non potest.* But there is no trace of this usage in Dante's latest works. In these, however, *quod* is used a few times like *ut* of purpose, thus: *oportet quod reducantur ad unum hominem, M. iii. 12. 11. Dato quod, Hoc supponatur quod, ad hoc quod* are the other phrases found in *M.*; the construction develops readily from the frequent use of *quod* in the sense of "that," plus a hortatory subjunctive. Dante had a model in a sentence from the Vulgate which he quotes in *M.* ii. 8. 63, — *hoc solum habemus residui, quod oculos nostros ad Te dirigamus.* Naturally the mood used is subjunctive, whereas *quod* in a clause of result takes the indicative in all but two instances, in one of which (*V.E. i. 15. 56*) the subjunctive is the apodosis in a conditional sentence, in the other of which (*V.E. i. 6. 3*) the verb *intelligantur* is perhaps due to an easy scribal error, though Rajna may be right in following the manuscripts.¹

Now just as *Ep.* x conforms to *V.E.* in the *quod* of result, so we find *A.T.* agreeing with *M.* in using a *quod* of purpose: *quod potest fieri per unum, melius est quod fiat per unum quam per plura* (14. 34). Likewise in *Ep.* iv. 51, a letter most probably authentic, we find: *quod contra Rhamnusiae spicula sis patiens te exhortor.* Certain instances in *V.E.* and *Ep.* x which also may belong here will be discussed below (page 23).

Quod occurs with the familiar causal sense, the usage being regular, but in the overwhelming majority of cases it signifies "that," and ranges through all shades of meaning from the classical use of *quod* after a verb like *miror* (*Ed.* ii. 24), to the freest constructions in indirect discourse. The indicative mood is regularly used, but if the statement is doubtful or denied, the subjunctive. Thus:

Sed dicere quod Ecclesia sic abutatur patrimonio . . . est valde inconueniens (M. iii. 13. 76); sed dicere quod in excellentissima Italorum curia sit libratum,

¹ Note, however, that the two manuscripts T and G read *intelligatur*, which might well arise from a misreading of *u* with superscribed stroke (= *un*) as *a*.

videtur nugatio (*V.E.* i. 17. 43); potest etiam probabiliter ostendi, quod aqua non habeat gibbum (*A.T.* 13. 32); Credunt enim vulgares . . . quod aqua ascendat (*A.T.* 23. 43).

In two of these instances, it will be noticed, the *quod* clause precedes. Dante has a further practice of using the subjunctive if the *quod* clause precedes, whatever the nature of the statement. This rule is abundantly exemplified in all the works. Thus:

Quod autem Monarcha potissime se habeat ad operationem iustitiae, quis dubitat? (*M.* i. 11. 141); Quod autem verum sit . . . sic declaro (*M.* iii. 2. 29); Et quod unum fuerit a principio confusionis . . . apparet (*V.E.* i. 9. 14); Quod autem de divina luce plus recipiat, potest probari per duo (*Ep.* x. 453); Quod etiam sequatur ipsum substare . . . sic declaro (*A.T.* 16. 44).

The reason for this peculiarity is probably that by placing the *quod* clause first, its substance is made a kind of subject for debate, just as a *quod* clause with the subjunctive is frequently used as the title of a chapter. A question is asked, and the prevailing atmosphere is one of uncertainty, which does not clear till the positive statement is given in the main verb. But put the main verb first and the situation changes; the feeling is one of assurance and the *quod* clause following expresses that feeling by the indicative. An exception which proves the rule is *V.E.* ii. 8. 80: *Quod autem dicimus tragica coniugatio, est quia*, etc. (Cf. *M.* iii. 5. 13.) Here, apart from the semicausal force of *quod*, there is no possible doubt of the truth of the statement, and the indicative naturally appears.

Naturally the subjunctive may appear with *quod* when necessitated by other constructions, as when the verb is also the apodosis of a conditional sentence contrary to fact (*V.E.* i. 9. 67; 13. 48; *Ep.* ix. 17; *A.T.* 10. 1, 5, 7). So, too, a hortatory or concessive subjunctive occurs, — a point which I have already discussed and may further illustrate by contrasting the two sentences following:

sicut ad hoc: Quod nemo . . . absque fide salvari potest (*M.* ii. 8. 28); sicut ad hoc: Quod homo pro salute patriae seipsum exponat (*M.* ii. 8. 11).

Exponat in the last sentence is the equivalent of *exponere debet*. It is an excessive feeling of the categorical imperative that results in the statement: *videtur quod quisque versificator debeat ipsum* [sc. *vulgare illustre*] *uti* (*V.E.* ii. 1. 20), where either *utatur* or *debet* would suffice. An interesting case is *A.T.* 16. 19–20: *dicamus quod non distet; et ponamus*

quod . . . *distet*, where the hortatory force in the subjunctive of the main verb flows over, unnecessarily, into the subordinate verbs. A bit looser still is *M.* iii. 2. 10: *Haec . . . veritas praefigatur, scilicet quod illud . . . Deus nolit.*

We have noticed that the present subjunctive with *si* is hortatory-concessive. Such a subjunctive influences that of *quod* in the sentences following:

Et si obiciatur de serpente loquente . . . vel de asina . . . quod locuti sint . . . respondemus (*V.E.* i. 2. 45). Hoc . . . attendendum est . . . quod si eptasyllabum interseratur in primo pede . . . eundem resumatur in altero (*V.E.* ii. 12. 74).

In the first of these examples there is also something of the flavor of indirect discourse. A similar and still more natural subjunctive by attraction appears when the main verb is apodosis of a conditional sentence contrary to fact, where the second subjunctive has more justification than in the preceding instances. Thus:

sequeretur . . . quod alterum scilicet esset frustra (*M.* ii. 6. 28; so i. 3. 43; iii. 6. 5; 10. 95); iam videretur quod Deus locutus exstisset (*V.E.* i. 4. 47); unde sequeretur . . . quod terra undique esset circumfusa (*A.T.* 16. 14).

The main verb in the subjunctive with a subjunctive in the *quod* clause occurs only in the instances I have quoted. In *A.T.* we find two cases of an antecedent subjunctive with an indicative in the *quod* clause:

Manifestum sit omnibus vobis quod, existente me Mantuae, quaestio quaedam exorta est (1. 1); Et praesciatur hoc, quod aqua non potest esse concentrica terrae (13. 8).

This is most natural; the categorical nature of the statement in the *quod* clause is so obvious, that an intruding subjunctive is not allowed. Remembering, however, *V.E.* ii. 12. 74, shall we say that the usage here is not Dante's? That were dangerous, especially as exact parallels may be found in *Ep.* vi. 57, and vii. 77, letters admittedly genuine. In *Ep.* vi. 180, the antecedent phrase *vestris animis infigenda supersunt* has exactly the force of *praesciatur* in the *A.T.* passage, and is followed by *quod* with the indicative. Again, these are the exceptions which prove the rule, and argue much more for the genuineness than for the spuriousness of *A.T.* I may now add that in one sentence in *M.*, although the main verb is not subjunctive, the indicative of the *quod* clause is preceded by a dependent

hortatory subjunctive, which, as in the example from the *A.T.*, fails to influence the mood of the following verb :

Dico ergo quod licet Luna non habeat lucem abundanter, nisi ut a Sole recipit, non propter hoc sequitur, quod, etc. (*M.* iii. 4. 130).

I have thus far shown that Dante, though not conforming to classical usage exactly, always means something by his subjunctives ; in fact he uses them subtly. There remains a curious usage in which a certain amount of fluctuation appears. The last quotation, completed, reads : *non propter hoc sequitur, quod ipsa Luna sit a Sole*. At first one might account for the subjunctive by the preceding negative, as in *M.* iii. 6. 39 ; 8. 70 ; and *A.T.* 23. 55 : *non propter hoc est necesse quod imitetur*. But the subjunctive is also found frequently after an affirmative form of *sequor*. Thus :

Ex quo sequitur, quod . . . Monarchia sit necessaria (*M.* i. 13. 69). Et ex hac conclusione sequitur . . . quod terra aequaliter . . . distet . . . et quod sit substans (*A.T.* 16. 7-10). Compare also *M.* i. 11. 88 ; ii. 2. 44 ; 7. 17 ; *A.T.* 12. 57.

There may be a touch of Dante's favorite categorical imperative in this subjunctive ; or it may be that in stating the conclusion of an argument he has in mind the subjunctive *quod* clause in which the original proposition might appear at the head of a chapter — a construction which may, as we have seen, explain the subjunctive in a *quod* clause preceding the verb. At any rate, the same usage appears after other expressions, besides *sequitur*, which indicate the drawing of a conclusion. Before turning to these, I wish to point out that the indicative is also used after *sequor*. The most striking instance is *M.* ii. 2. 47, 48, where the subjunctive has just been used :

Et . . . sequitur ulterius quod divina voluntas sit ipsum ius. Et iterum ex hoc sequitur quod ius . . . nihil est aliud quam similitudo divinae voluntatis. So *M.* i. 12. 93 ; 14. 17 ; iii. 2. 48.

May we not explain this difference thus, — that if he is thinking primarily of the process of drawing a conclusion, he uses the subjunctive, whereas if his attention is centered on the fact that he has proved, he uses the indicative ? The essence of the matter may be further illustrated by a passage in *A.T.* 6. 8-9 :

quare oppositum eius ex quo sequebatur est verum, scilicet quod aqua sit altior terra. Consequentia probatur per hoc, quod aqua naturaliter fertur deorsum.

The first *quod* clause with the subjunctive states a conclusion; the second *quod* clause with the indicative states a premise, an established fact, of use in drawing a conclusion.

But to turn to other formulæ. *Consequens est* is evidently a synonym for *sequitur*. It takes *quod* with the subjunctive in *M.* i. 11. 139; iii. 16. 8; *V.E.* i. 4. 41; *Ep.* x. 106; *A.T.* 15. 15; 21. 34. *Rationabile est*, or *videtur esse*, has much the same meaning, particularly as we find the phrase in close connection with *consequens est* (*V.E.* i. 4. 37-41). It takes the subjunctive in the passage just cited, in *V.E.* i. 15. 29, and *A.T.* 7. 5. *Restat* means not "it remains to prove" but "it follows," in *M.* ii. 2. 28, 32, where it takes the subjunctive. Just so *relinquitur*, *M.* iii. 12. 13, *A.T.* 20. 44, and especially 4. 7-9:

Et cum locus tanto sit nobilior [this amounts to a premise] . . . relinquitur, quod locus aquae sit altior loco terrae, et per consequens quod aqua sit altior terra.

Colligitur has the subjunctive with *quod* (*M.* iii. 15. 52) and also the indicative (*M.* i. 13. 33). *Unde fit quod* is surely a phrase denoting inference; it is found only in *M.*, where it takes now the subjunctive (ii. 2. 50; iii. 3. 26; 16. 109), now the indicative (i. 13. 7; 15. 13). *Hinc est quod* has the subjunctive (*V.E.* i. 18. 39), or the indicative (*M.* i. 4. 19; 12. 27). *Inde est quod* occurs only in *Ep.* x. 479, 618, where it has the indicative. *Signum (est) quod* is a peculiarity of *V.E.*, where once it has the subjunctive (i. 8. 45), and once the indicative (ii. 5. 34). The usage of *V.E.* goes rather far in allowing the subjunctive after *apparet* (ii. 1. 31) or *videtur* (ii. 1. 20) (see above on the hortatory subjunctive, page 19),¹ and just so *Ep.* x in *Propter quod patet quod* with the subjunctive. In *M.* the indicative not infrequently appears where the subjunctive might be expected, especially in *M.* ii. 2. 39 ff., where we find *Ex his iam liquet quod* and the indicative, followed by *sequitur ulterius quod* and the subjunctive, and that by *Et iterum ex hoc sequitur quod* and the indicative (see above, page 22). *Concludo* is a word which on the above principle ought normally to take the subjunctive; it appears with *quod* only in *A.T.* where once (23. 51) it has the subjunctive, and once (23. 17) the indicative. Surely this subtle conformity with Dante's usage and no less subtle divergence from it in *Ep.* x and *A.T.* bespeak the genuineness of these works. On

¹ Perhaps the subjunctive with *videtur quod* betokens the doubtfulness of the statement, as often in St. Thomas, e.g., *Sum. Contra Gent.* iii. 46, 47.

finding in *A.T.* two instances of a pleonastic *quod*, which nowhere else occurs, I regard the proof not as weakened, but as strengthened. Thus:

Dico ergo, quod si aqua sit in A, et habeat transitum, quod naturaliter movebitur ad B (*A.T.* 12. 19, 20; so 21. 32, 34).

Another detail deserves mention here. In one or two instances we note that *A.T.* and *V.E.* show a common peculiarity which is seen in none of the other works. Thus *credo quod*, *respondetur quod*, *rationabile est* (or *videtur esse*) *quod*, the last phrase with its peculiar subjunctive, are found in *A.T.* and *V.E.* but not elsewhere. Significant concurrences of this sort are especially worth noting in view of the date of publication of these two works. Moncetti published *A.T.* in 1508. As *V.E.*, of which only two manuscripts are known to-day, was not published in translation and was hardly known till 1529, and as the Latin text did not appear till 1577, it is not likely that Moncetti was acquainted with the work. Noting then the minute agreements between *V.E.* and *A.T.* which I have indicated, and others which will later appear, we must abandon once for all the supposition that Moncetti forged the *A.T.* Moreover, it is at least doubtful whether Moncetti knew *M.*, for although Marsilio Ficino had translated the work at the end of the fifteenth century, the *editio princeps* did not appear till 1559. If Moncetti did not know *M.*, we must add to the coincidences between *A.T.* and *V.E.* a vastly more numerous array, as we shall see, of coincidences between *A.T.* and *M.* which could not possibly have arisen by chance.¹

Not much chronological evidence may be found in the *quod* constructions. We have noted that the use of *quod* and the indicative in a result clause is rather frequent in *V.E.*, but appears only once later, in *Ep.* x. Another characteristic of *V.E.* is the use of *secundum quod*, which occurs eight times in Book i and eight times in Book ii, and only scatteringly in the later works.

I subjoin a list of the different words followed by *quod* in the sense of "that."

V.E., *Ep.* x, *A.T.*, and *M.*; consequens est, dico, manifestum est, patet, probo, scio.

V.E. and *A.T.*; credo, rationabile est (or esse videtur), respondetur.

¹ Only the *Convivio* had been printed when *A.T.* appeared, as Moore remarks, *Studies in Dante*, Second Series, p. 307. Of course it should not be forgotten that *M.* was accessible in a fairly large number of manuscripts.

V.E., *A.T.*, and *M.*; apparet.

V.E. and *M.*; hinc est, testor (also in *M.* testis est, testimonium perhibet), video.

• *V.E.* alone; allego, argumentor, attendo, considero, ecce, fateor, indagor, obicitur, palatur, praetereo, in mente premo, in promptu est, signum est.

Ep. x, *A.T.*, and *M.*; praenoto.

Ep. x and *M.*; constat, oportet.

Ep. x alone; inde est, praenuncio.

A.T. and *M.*; arguo, declaro, ostendo, relinquitur, sequitur, scilicet.

A.T. alone; concludo, imaginor, necesse est, praescio, pono.

M. alone; adverto, ait, assero, canto, comprobo, colligo, dato, deprehendo, dubito, habeo, innotesco, liquet, memini, non obstante, praefigo, satis persuasum est, planum est, restat, revelatum est, scribo, suppono, unde est, unde fit, vaticinor.

Quia is used less frequently (one hundred sixty-nine times) in Dante than *quod* (four hundred fifty-three times). It also differs in meaning. From *Purg.* iii. 37: *State contente, humana gente, al quia* (= τὸ ὅτι, "simple fact")¹ one might imagine that Dante generally used *quia* in the sense of "that" and not "because." The reverse is true. It means "that" in only nine instances. Thus:

Satis igitur declarata subadsumpta principali, patet quia conclusio certa est (*M.* i. 11. 147; so *V.E.* ii. 10. 1, 2).

In *M.* iii. 6. 19, it is plainly used for variety or clearness, as a *quod* "that" immediately precedes in the same clause. *M.* iii. 9. 132 is a quotation from the Vulgate; iii. 9. 75 and 117 are virtually quotations. In *V.E.* i. 2. 31 a *quod* "that" clause precedes. In *V.E.* i. 18. 18 (*Quia vero aulicum nominamus, illud causa est*), the particle is semicausal, as in *Ep.* x. 94 (*Cuius ratio est quia*). Thus *quia* "that" is practically excluded by Dante, nor does St. Thomas use the particle often in this sense.² A hasty glance at Albertus Magnus and Duns Scotus indicates that their practice is similar. Can it be that Dante uses *quia* in the *Purgatorio* not as meaning "that," a symbol of mere fact, but as meaning "since," and suggesting an appeal to some assured principle which the logician employs in drawing a conclusion? Thus:

Verum quia omnis veritas, quae non est principium, ex veritate alicuius principii fit manifesta; necesse est, etc. (*M.* i. 2. 16).

¹ Cf. Pope, *Moral Essays*, i. 99: In vain the sage, with retrospective eye, Would from th' apparent What conclude the Why.

² See L. Schüss, *Thomas-Lexikon*, 1881, p. 285.

This usage is extremely frequent in the three authors mentioned. Dante's remark might mean, therefore, "Be content, human race, with established principles, and spend not too much time in seeking new truth by ratiocination." But lest this explanation be thought more subtle than scholasticism itself, I would rather take *quia* in the usual fashion, since it does occur, even though very rarely, in the sense of "that," and since Dante needs a rime-word here. It would be interesting to know whether any author of the period used the word regularly in indirect discourse.

As to other uses of *quia*, I will note merely that in all the four works the particle not infrequently is initial, with the force of *nam*: and that in all the verb is now and then omitted, as:

Cum ergo Monarcha sit universalissima causa inter mortales, ut . . . bene vivant, quia principes alii per illum, ut dictum est (*M.* i. 11. 138); non est extra materiam naturalem, quia inter ens mobile (*A.T.* 20. 11).

In *Ep.* x. 221-222, this usage is so extended that the particle almost means "to wit":

Nam si ad materiam respiciamus, a principio horribilis et foetida est, quia Infernus; in fine prospera . . . quia Paradisus.

In *M.* iii. 5. 4, the meaning is surely "to wit":

dicentes, quod de femore Iacob fluxit figura horum duorum regiminum, quia Levi et Iudas.

A study of all the constructions used by Dante in indirect discourse would be interesting, but I cannot undertake it here. That there is probably no fixed ratio between the use of the infinitive and *quod* appears in the constructions with *dico*, which will be found in the Concordance. Also apparent in all his works is the fondness for using the direct discourse after *dico*. An interesting combination of a *quod* clause and an infinitive clause occurs in *M.* i. 14. 17:

Sequitur, non solum melius esse fieri per unum . . . sed quod fieri per unum est bonum, per plura simpliciter malum.

This may be matched with *Ep.* x. 344:

ubi dicit se fuisse in primo coelo et quod dicere vult de regno coelesti quid quid . . . potuit retinere.

There should be no semicolon after *coelo*, as in Moore's edition.

I have selected only a few syntactical peculiarities for discussion, but the reader of the Concordance will find many other matters to strengthen his faith in the authenticity of *Ep.* x and *A.T.* by examining, for instance, the articles *cum*, *dum*, *ubi*, *ut* (*uti*), *licet*, *quamquam*, *quamvis*, *quando*, *quare* with indirect question, and indirect questions in general, the reflexives *sui* and *suus*, and the auxiliary use of the perfect of *sum*. The evidence therein contained, added to what we have already noted, should dispose once for all of the possibility of forgery on the part of a later writer like Moncetti, who lived at a time when Latin style had undergone a thorough transformation. One who would declare *A.T.* and *Ep.* x spurious is thus driven to the supposition that both treatises are forgeries of the fourteenth century. But even then the burden of proof would rest upon him: he must explain away the many minute coincidences with Dante's genuine writings. Complete evidence cannot be presented until further study is made of the writers of Dante's time, that common traits of the period may be distinguished from peculiarities of Dante. It would be profitable, for instance, to examine the writers quoted by Biagi¹ who were interested in the subject discussed in *A.T.* I will appeal to one example of an almost contemporary style, a style at least antedating the new humanistic Latinity,² namely that of Villani. The opening sections of his commentary on the *Inferno* are of special interest, seeing that his material is based in part on *Ep.* x. I note certain resemblances to Dante's usages; the use of a present subjunctive in a *si* clause seems similar. But a rapid glance reveals several important details in which Villani is not at one with Dante. One is a frequent use of *siquidem*, generally post-positive, in the sense of *enim*, which I find in Villani wherever I turn; Dante does not use *siquidem* (or *si quidem*) at all. Another striking fact is that in Villani *quod* "that" hardly occurs. In the first thirteen chapters of the *Comento*, a section surely larger than *Ep.* x, I have discovered only *two* after a hasty search, and there cannot be many more. One of these is especially interesting. It occurs in chapter x (p. 34 Cugnoni) where Villani is defining *comedia*. He says:

Ad quorum intelligentiam scire debemus, quod ab hoc greco nomine comos, quod latine villa sonat, et oda, cantus dicitur comedia, hoc est villanus cantus.

¹ *Op. cit.*, pp. 181 ff.

² See G. Cugnoni's edition of Villani's *Comento al Primo Canto dell' Inferno*, 1896, in Passerini, *Collez. di Opusc. Dant.*, vol. xxxi, pp. 18 ff.

But this is virtually a quotation of Dante's words (*Ep.* x, 190 ff.):

Ad cuius notitiam sciendum est, quod comoedia dicitur a *comus*, *villa*, et *oda*, quod est *cantus*, unde *comoedia* quasi *villanus cantus*.

It is curious that the author of *Ep.* x should use *sciendum est*, which is very frequent in Dante, while Villani should change this to *scire debemus* which Dante never uses. A bit later (*l.* 218) Dante declares:

Et per hoc patet, quod Comoedia dicitur praesens opus.

This time Villani (p. 35) changes the construction to one more familiar to him:

Bene igitur, si diligenter opus totum nostri comici spectetur, rite comedia titulabitur.

If Villani forged *Ep.* x, as some believe,¹ he possessed both tremendous intuition and a most curious method. Rather he is dealing with a source, and the personality of the forger, as in the case of *A.T.*, must be pushed further back, — back, I believe, until it loses its hypothetical existence and merges with that of Dante himself.

But I turn now from syntax to Dante's vocabulary again, in the hopes of finding evidence not only for the genuineness of the disputed works, but for the chronological order assumed at the beginning of this paper. Let me state again that I mean this as deductive, not inductive, proof; starting with the order *V.E.*, *Ep.* x, *A.T.*, *M.*, I aim merely to show that stylistic traits are in conformity with it.

Assuming *V.E.* to be the earliest of the four works, we find the following words or idioms used exclusively (black letter) or largely (italics) in this work, but rarely or never in the three later works; occurrences elsewhere than in the four works are sometimes indicated in parentheses. As in the general list given above (p. 15 f.) I have excluded words which seem primarily demanded by the nature of the subject, though in this matter it is hard to draw the line.

affirmo, *attendo*, **brevissimus**, **brevius**, *ceu*, *circa*, **comminiscor**, *conceptio*, **conceptus**, **conicio**, **consensus**, **consequenter**, **contanter**, **convinco** (arg.), **corporaliter**, **cunctus**, *deinceps*, *demum*, **diffinio** (*V.E.* ii), *directe*, **discretive**, **discussio**, **disiunctim**, **disiungo**, **dissentio**, **dissero**, **dissuasorie**, *doctrina*, *dumtaxat*, **elucido**, *etenim* (rare in *M.*, *A.T.*, not in *Ep.* x), **examino**, **excellens** (*excellentior* *Ep.* x), **excellenter**, **excellencia** (*A.T.*), **excellantissime**, **excellentissimus**, **excellentius**,

¹ See Moore, *Studies in Dante*, Third Series, p. 345.

excello, exinde, extimatio, extrinsecus¹ adj. (*extrinsecus* adv. Ep. ii), extrorsum, factura, falsissimus (but cf. *fallo* etc. under A.T. and M., pages 33, 34), fateor, fere, figurate, fortassis, forte (contrast *forsan*, *fortasse*, M., *forsitan* M., Ep. x), frequentior (cf. *frequens* Ecl. ii), *frequentē* (*frequentius* Ep. iii), *frequento*, gratulanter, habituo, idcirco, imitatio (cf. *imitor* M., V.E., A.T., *imitabilis* A.T.), imperfecte (cf. *imperfectus* M.), incongruus, inconveniēter (cf. *inconveniēns* M.), incunctanter, individuum, innovo, ironice, irregularis, lector (vocative), membratim, mentio, mixtura (*mixtio* A.T.), *mox*, multimode, *necnon* (very rare in the other works), *necubi*, *nempe*, nequicquam, *ni*, nugatio, num, omnimode, oretenus, orientaliter, *paene*, partim, passim, paulatim, pendo, *penitus*, penso, *perpendo*, perplures, perscrutor, *perspicaciter*, perspicio, persuasio, persuasorie (*persuadeo*, *persuasor*, M.), *pertracto* (once in M., Ep. x), pessime, posterus (*in posterum* V.E., Ep. i), postmodum, praecedenter (*praecedens* M., V.E., *praecedo* M., V.E., A.T.), praeimmediatus, *praepono*, praerogativa, praerogo, *praetermitto*, *primitus*, principio vb., progressio, progressive, proinde, prorsus, *puta*, *puto*, quamplures, *quapropter*, *quare* (cf. especially initial *quare* in the sense of *igitur*), quicquid (elsewhere *quidquid*. But are our texts certain on this point?), *quis* indef. (distinctly less frequent later), quomodocunque, quotquot, raro (*rarius* Ep. ix), rarissime, ratiocinor, rationaliter, rationabilis, *rationabilis* (A.T.), *rationalis*, *recolo*, *reviso* "to review," saepissime, secundarius (*secundario* M.), segregatim, seligo, sensibilis, *sensualis*, sensualitas, significatus, singulatim, spirituatus, subintelligo, subsecundarius, successio, successive, *successivus*, supercedo, superexcellētia, taliter, *tenus* (only in *superficie* *tenus* V.E. ii), *tot*, *tottot*, *tracto*, trifarie, trifarius, utrinque, utrobique, verumtamen, vestigo, *videlicet* (*scilicet* is more frequent in M., Ep. x, A.T.), *videtur* (arg.), vilipendo, *voco*.

One interesting peculiarity I reserve for the last, — Dante's use of *venor*. In V.E. he engages his readers in an imaginary hunt for the *vulgare illustre*. *Decentiorē atque illustrem Italiae venemur loquelam*, he declares (V.E. i. 11. 3), and after the search, *postquam venati saltus et pascua sumus Italiae* (i. 16. 1). The word is used thus figuratively ten times in all, and it is not surprising that later, in M., he should twice revert to it in a general sense: *Ad bene quoque venandum veritatem quaesiti* (ii. 8. 1) and *hanc veritatem venantes* (iii. 3. 113). Clearly these passages are later than those in V.E., granting that Dante is the first to use *venor* thus colorlessly.

The above instance is typical of a certain quality in V.E., namely an endeavor to substitute the picturesque — sometimes the grandiloquent — for the technical terms of argumentation. There is a seasoning of poetry in the style of V.E. This peculiarity is not maintained later on, even in

M. ii, which in theme and in spirit is even nearer to poetry than *V.E.* is. I will quote one more of many possible instances. Contrast *Postquam . . . de veritate primae . . . inquisitum est, instat nunc* (*M.* ii. 2. 3) with *Praeparatis fustibus . . . nunc fasciandi tempus incumbit* (*V.E.* ii. 8. 2). Other instances of this picturesqueness or grandiloquence may be found under *cribro*, *decerpo*, *depompo*, *divarico*, *extricatus*, *perplexus*, *potiono*, *progressio*.

The above list of favorite expressions of *V.E.* which occur rarely or not at all later may be supplemented by a list of those developed later, being found rarely or never in *V.E.* Various instances have already been given in the general list above (page 15 f.). To these I would add the following :

arguo (*argumentor* appears only in *V.E.*), *manifestus*, *sic* (fewer in *V.E.* i than later).

V.E. and *Ep.* x, according to the hypothesis that I am following, were separated by twelve years or more. We shall therefore not expect to find many significant peculiarities in which they agree against the other works. The following, however, may be mentioned :

Affinitas, alias, alternus, breviter, congruus, ergo (In *V.E.* and *Ep.* x *ergo* is almost always postpositive. In *A.T.* and *M.* Dante shows a preference for initial *ergo*, especially in *A.T.* and *M.* ii. When it is used postpositively in *A.T.* and *M.*, the part preceding is almost always a minor word, e.g. *cum*, *ubi*, *si*, *est*, *dico*. In the earlier works the usage is freer in this respect; e.g. *oportuit*, *rationabiliter*, *praesumpsit*, *trilingues*, etc. in *V.E.*; *praeferens*, *differt*, *dividitur*, *vidit*, in *Ep.* x), **generalis, generaliter, hucusque, libet, plerumque, postea, praelibo** (arg.), **praetereo, primordium, que** (rare in Dante except in poetry or in poetically flavored prose, such as *V.E.* i [twenty-two times], ii [ten times], *M.* ii [twenty-seven times, of which nineteen are quotations], *Ep.* vi [seven times]). It is not strange that *que* does not occur in *A.T.*; in *M.* iii it occurs only twice. *Ep.* x with eight instances conforms to *V.E.* ii), **quidni, quod** with the indicative in a clause of result (see above, page 19), **quoque** (cf. *que*. Found in *Ecl.*, twice; *V.E.*, fifteen times; *Ep.* x, twice; none in *A.T.* or *M.* except three in *M.* ii), **recordor, sector** (arg.), **trado** ("set down," "give," deriving from the meaning "hand down," which we find in *M.*: *ut Lucas in Evangelio suo tradit*. Cf. *V.E.*: *Volentes igitur modum tradere quo*, etc., and *Ep.* x: *Volentes igitur introductionem tradere*, etc.).

From the above occurrences one could never prove that *V.E.* and *Ep.* x were written at the same time. They are useful indications, however, that the two works are by the same author.

We have noticed before the significance of coincidences between *A.T.* and *V.E.* if, as is well-nigh certain, Moncetti was not familiar with the latter work. To those already given I may add the following, which, as with the list just given, indicate identity of authorship though not adjacent dates of composition.

Accido, aequivocatio, artificialis, cognitio, consimilis, contra (arg.), *diversifico, diversimode, diversitas, excellentia* (cf. *excellens* etc. in *V.E.*), *donec, identitas, instruo, praescio, quasi* "almost" (*V.E.* i. 8. 34; cf. *A.T.* 19. 60, 63), *rationalis, refert, regularis, resulto, stultitia, ultra* adv., *versus* prep.

The following coincidences between *V.E.* and *M.* are worth noticing :

Abhorreo, absurdus, accidens, actio, adeo adv., *adiutorium, aequalis, aliquatiter, antequam, ascisco, astruo, attestor, beneplacitum, converto* (arg.), *distinguo* (arg.), *dubito, dubius, dummodo, dupliciter, edoceo, elicio* (arg.), *enucleo* (arg.), *expresse, facile* adv., *gradatim, informo, ingredior, innotesco, intentatus, iterum, manifeste, medium* (arg.), *mensura* (arg.), *mensuro, minime, modo, necessario, nemo, nuncupo, obicio, obiectum, paucus, plerique, prae, praeallegatus, praesertim, primum, priusquam, probatio, procul dubio, prorsus, qualiter, quodammodo, rectius, regula, resumo* (arg.), *singularis, solutio, speculatio, statim, subsisto, testor, testimonium, ubicumque, ullus, unicus, umquam.*

Once more, while this list shows significant coincidences in minor usages which bespeak a common authorship, one could not prove from them that the two works were written in close succession. Some of the peculiarities are, as noted, found in other works as well, and the number of those that remain is no greater proportionally than that given for *V.E.* and *A.T.*, which is not one third the length of *M.* There is thus no confirmation here of Wicksteed's theory as to the date of *M.* I can add that though *V.E.* i and ii show individual differences, just as the books of *M.* do, there is nothing to indicate that, as some have supposed, they were written in different periods.

Turning now to *Ep.* x, we find just as with its general vocabulary, tested by words beginning with A, so with the minor peculiarities in question, that the individuality of the author is shown by certain words or usages which occur mainly or only here. The list is :

causo, circumlocutio, circumloquor, connaturalitas, consideratio, consonanter, consuesco, convertibilis (arg.), *corporalis, credulitas, definitivus, descriptivus, digressivus, dispar, divisivus, doctrinalis, dogma, duplum, excellentior* (cf. *excellens* etc. in *V.E.*), *excessivus, excessus, executivus, existentia, exordior,*

expono (arg.), expositio, exterminium, fictivus, formabilis, formativus, formula, improbativus, *incertitudo*, inchoo, 'infinitus,' insinuo, investigatio, literalis, literaliter, metaphorismus, negotium (phil.), nimis, nullatenus, obvio, persen-
seo, persaeptus, polysemus, positivus, possibilitas, *posterius*, praenunciatio, 'primarius,' probativus, risibilis (phil.), sempiterno vb., sententio vb., seor-
sim, subtilis, suppositio, transumptivus, votivus. A fondness for adjectives in *ivus* (*tivus*) appears in Ep. x, with which only M. may be compared in this respect.

I have noted only few coincidences between *Ep.* x and *A.T.* not elsewhere found, and owing to the brevity of these works we should not expect many.

The following are the most significant :

adaequo, designo, ad evidentiam dicendorum, ethica, magnitudo, materialis.

For *Ep.* x and *M.* there is a much longer list, from which, however, we could not infer that the dates of these two works lay in close proximity.

Allegorice, *amplio*, antecedens n., aperte, assigno, assumptio (arg.), *at*, *causo*, compendiose, competit, connecto, defectus, devenio (arg.), discurro, dispositio, *doceo*, elongo, essentia, *exprimo*, factum, forsitan (cf. *forte* etc. in V.E.), incorruptibilis, infinitum, intellectivus, *intellectualis*, intelligentia, *introitus* (arg.), intuitus, *iuxta*, licentio, *liquet*, manifestatio, mediate, *moralis*, mysticus, nequaquam, notitia, perduco (*ad vitam aeternam* M., *ad statum felicitatis* Ep. x), practicus, praecimineo, praeceminentia, praefigo, processus (arg.), *propterea*, prosequor (arg.), *quinimmo*, relativum, *saepe*, salutatio, specialis, speculativus, *suadeo*, subicio (arg.), supra adv.

I have found no significant evidence whatsoever from stylistic peculiarities against the genuineness of *Ep.* x.

The individual peculiarities of *A.T.* are :

certior (cf. *certitudo* M., A.T.), circiter, citissime, *citra*, *concupiscibilis*, con-
fingo, continue, *demonstratio* (M.), *demonstro* (M.), *disco*, disputo (cf. *disputatio* M., A.T.), exaro, homogeneous, idealiter (cf. *idea* M.), imaginatio, imaginor, imitabilis (cf. *imitatio* etc. in V.E.), impossibilitas, 'incomprehensibilis,' in-
discussus, indubitabiliter (cf. *indubitabilis* M.), inductio, innatus, inobedientia (phil.), membrum (arg.), miscibilis, mixtio, mobilis (cf. *mobile* M., A.T.), neuter (arg.), obedibilis (phil.), obedio (phil.), ostensivus (cf. *ostensive* M.), potentia-
tus, privatio, probabiliter (cf. *probabilis* M.), qualifico, restringo (arg.), *sensi-
tivus*, substo, sufficiens, terminabilis, uniformiter (cf. *uniformis* M. and A.T.), *virtualis* (*virtuo*, *virtuosius*, only in M. and A.T.).

It will be noticed that about a fourth of these words appear also or have analogues in *M*. Coming now to a complete, or nearly complete, list of coincidences between *A.T.* and *M*., one cannot fail to be impressed by its length and significance.

admitto (arg.), **adverto**, **aequaliter**, **aequinoctialis**, **alibi**, **ambo**, **apud** (cf. *apud negantes divinam bonitatem*, *apud oblique politizantes*, *M.*, and *apud recte philosophantes* *A.T.*), **certitudo**, **circulatio**, **complexionatus**, **conclusio**, **confirmitas**, **consequentia**, **declaro**, **deorsum**, **destruo** (arg.), **determinatio**, **determino**, **dispensator**, **dispenso**, **disputatio**, **dissolvo** (arg.), **distinctio** (arg.), **documentum**, **efficacia** (arg.), **efficiens** (phil.), **ens**, **ex** (is rare in *V.E.* and *Ep. x* and is used only four times in the former, never in the latter, in argumentative phrases, as *ut ex praemissis manifestum est*. But in *A.T.* there are fourteen instances of **ex** in this sense, while the occurrences in the different books of *M.* are more numerous still. The phrase *ex parte* 'with respect to' [e.g. *ex parte boni . . . ex parte vero mali*] is found only in *A.T.* and *M.* The phrase *ex notioribus nobis* [used of drawing an inference] is found in *A.T.* 20. 20 and *Ep. v.* 122), **excludo** (arg.), **experientia**, **facilis** (*facile est* *A.T.*, *de facili* *M.*), **facillime**, **fullo**, **falsitas**, **figura** (*per primam* or *secundam figuram*), **finalis**, **fundo** vb. (arg.), **generabilis**, **genero**, **ibidem**, **includo**, **influentia**, **infra** adv. (*ut infra patebit* *M.*, *A.T.*), **inquisitio** (*inquiro* in all four works), **instantia**, **insto** (arg.), **insum**, **insuper**, **item** (arg.), **maior** (arg.), **manifestissimus**, **melius est**, **mendacium** (arg.), **minor** (arg.), **mobile** (cf. *mobilis* *A.T.*), **multoties**, **naturaliter**, **necesse**, **notus**, **nullus** adj. ("nothing worth," as *dico quod sua probatio nulla est* and *et sic . . . instantia nulla est* *M.*; *sed talis instantia nulla est* *A.T.*), **opinio**, **opinor**, **particularis** (cf. *particulariter*, *particulo*, *M.*), **possibilis**, **potentia** = *δύναμις* (cf. *potentiatus* *A.T.*), **potissime**, **potissimus**, **praedicare** (arg.), **principalis** (arg.), **prohibeo**, **proportio**, **propositio**, **propter primum** (*propter primam partem* *Ep. x*), **quaestio**, **recipio** (phil.; *in quantum propria natura [natura rei] recipere potest [recipit]* *M.*, *A.T.*), **relinquitur quod**, **removeo** (arg.), **secundum quid**, **solvo** (arg.), **sophisticus**, **subiaceo** (phil.), **subiectus** (phil.), **subtiliter** (cf. *subtilis* *Ep. x*, *subtilius* *V.E.*), **suppono** (arg.), **sylogismus**, **tango** (arg., *quod [ut] superius tangebatur* *M.*, *A.T.*), **theoremata**, **totalis** (*totaliter* in all four), **ultra** prep., **uniformis** (cf. *uniformiter* *A.T.*), **unitas**, **universalis**, **valde**, **virtuo** (*virtuans* *M.*, *virtuatus* *A.T.*; cf. *specificatus* *M.*, *spirituatus* *V.E.*), **virtuosius**, **vis** (arg.).

This is too long a list of coincidences, it seems to me, to explain merely by the fact that *A.T.* and *M.* are nearer in theme to one another than to the other works. Exact statistics in a matter of this sort are impossible, but it is safe to say that the number of significant coincidences with *M.* in *A.T.* is twice that in *Ep. x*, and twice that in *V.E.*; this latter reckoning, further, should be more than doubled since *V.E.* is more than twice

as long as *A.T.* I am tempted, therefore, to regard as the explanation not merely the fact that Dante at two different periods argues abstrusely and hence falls upon the same terms; *M.* ii is quite as poetical in feeling as *V.E.*, and yet it conforms in these peculiarities to the style of the other books. My theory would be that Dante, impelled by the nature of the subject, employed logical terminology more systematically in *A.T.* than he had done before, and that he continued this style and developed it in the work that immediately followed, namely his last work, *M.* The mood in which he had written *A.T.* was still on him.¹

As with *Ep.* x, I have found no stylistic usages in *A.T.* which argue against the genuineness of that work.

Let us finally consider the peculiarities of *M.*, which not unnaturally outnumber those of any other work.

aut (until *M.* *vel* is far more frequent), *commode*, *compositio*, *comprobo*, *concorditer*, *conscribo*, *consequor* (arg.), *consonat*, *consonus* (cf. *consonanter* *Ep.* x), *constituo*, *constitutivus*, *construo* (arg.), *contradictorium*, *contrarietas*, *contrarius* (cf. *contrarius*, *contrarium*, *M.*, *V.E.*, *A.T.*), *cooperatio* (phil.), *corruptivus*, 'credibilis,' *declaratio* (cf. *declaro* especially in *M.* and *A.T.*), *definitio*, *destructive* (arg., cf. *destructio* *M.*, *Ep.* x, *A.T.*, *destruo* *M.*, *A.T.*), *deviatio*, *differentialis* (cf. *differentia* *M.*, *V.E.*, *A.T.*), *directivum*, *directivus*, *diremtio* (arg.), *dispono*, *distinctivus* (cf. *distinctio* *M.*, *A.T.*), *distribuo* (arg.), *distributio* (arg.), *dubitatio* (cf. *dubito* *M.*, *V.E.*, etc.), *efficax* (arg.), *efficacissimus* (cf. *efficacia*, *efficiens*, *M.*, *A.T.*, *efficio* *M.*, *V.E.*, *A.T.*), *erga*, *erro* (cf. *error* *M.*, *V.E.*, *Ep.* x, etc.), *evidens*, *evidentissime* (cf. *evidenter* *M.*, *V.E.*, *evidentia* *M.*, *V.E.*, *Ep.* x, *A.T.*), *executor*, *expressus* (cf. *expresse* *M.*, *V.E.*), *extensio* (phil.), *extremitas* (arg.), *de facili*, *facilius*, adv. (cf. *facile est* *A.T.*), *facile* adv. (*facilior* *M.*, *V.E.*, *Ep.* x, *facillime* *M.*, *A.T.*), *factibilis*, *falsus*, (*A.T.* etc., cf. *fallo* *M.*, *A.T.*, etc., *falsissimus* *V.E.*, *falsitas* *M.*, *A.T.*, etc.), *figuro* (cf. *figurate* *V.E.*), *finco*, *finitus* (phil.), *formale*, *formaliter*, *formo*, *foran*, *fortasse* (cf. *forsitan* *M.*, *Ep.* x, etc., *fortassis* *V.E.* *forte* *V.E.* etc.), *fundamentalis*, *fundamentum* (cf. *fundo* arg., *M.*, *A.T.*), *habitualis* (phil.), *habitus* = ἦξις (used differently in *V.E.*), *iam* (arg., *M.*, *V.E.*?), *idea* (cf. *idealiter* *A.T.*), *illatio* (arg.), *immanifester*, *imperfectus* (cf. *imperfecte* *V.E.*), *importo*, *imputo*, *inconveniens*, *incorruptibilitas* (cf. *incorruptibilis* *M.*, *Ep.* x), *incredibilis*, *indispositio*, *indispositus*, *indubitabilis* (cf. *indubitabiliter* *A.T.*), *inductivus* (cf. *inductio* *A.T.*), *infallibilis*, *infero* (arg.), *infra* prep. (cf. *infra* adv., *A.T.* etc.), *inopinabilis*, *inquam*, *intentio* (*A.T.* etc.), *interemptio* (arg.), *interemptivus*, *interimo* (arg.), *introduco*, *irrationabilis*, *irrefragabilis*, *iterum* (arg., *V.E.*?), *iuxta*, *logicalis*,

¹ I will not deny the possibility, suggested by Dr. Wilkins, that Dante began *M.* first and wrote it and *A.T.* at the same time.

logicus, longe, medio vb., *medium* (arg.), *memini*, *minoratio*, *narro* (cf. *narratio* Ep. x), *necessito* (cf. *necessitas* M., V.E., Ep. x, A.T., etc., *necessarius* M., V.E., A.T., etc., *necessario* M., V.E.), *nefas*, *negatio*, *nihilominus*, *nimietas*, *nondum*, *ob*, *oblique* (arg., cf. *obliquus* M., V.E.), *obsto* (only in *nulla vi . . . obstante, non obstante quod*), *omnino*, *operatio* (once in V.E.), *operativus*, *optime*, *ordino* (V.E., A.T., etc.), *ostensive* (cf. *ostensivus* A.T.), *otiose*, *otiosus* (phil.), *pariter et*, *partialis*, *particulariter*, *particulo* (cf. *particularis* M., A.T.), *patentissimus* (arg.), 'paulo,' *per prius*, *perago* (arg.), *perhibeo*, *persaepe* (cf. *persaepeius* Ep. x), *perseitas*, *personalis* (cf. *persona* M., Ep. x, A.T.), *persuadentior*, *persuadeo*, *persuasor* (cf. *persuasio*, *persuasorie*, V.E.), *pertinaciter* (arg.), *pertingo* (phil.), *philosophicus* (cf. *philosophia* Ep. x, A.T., etc.), *placet* (as *ut Philosopho placet*, cf. *placuit* A.T. etc.), *pluralitas*, *plurimum* adv., 'porro,' *post* adv., *praedicatum* (cf. *praedico* M., A.T., etc.), *praeoperor*, *praeostendo*, *praepeditivus*, *praesentialiter*, *produco* (phil.), *productio*, *profecto*, *prohibitio*, *prohibitivus* (cf. *prohibeo* M., A.T.), *proprietas*, *proprius* adv., 'quamdiu,' *quatenus*, *quousque*, *realis*, *rectrix*, *recurso* (arg.), *redarguo*, *reduco* (arg., V.E., Ep. x, A.T., etc.; cf. *habere reduci* M., A.T.), *refello*, *refuto*, *regulatrix*, *renarro*, *resolvo* (arg.), *respective*, *rursus* (arg.), *sane*, *scriba* (cf. *scribo* M., Ep. x, A.T., etc.), *secundario* (cf. *secundarius* V.E.), *sortior* (arg.), *specialiter* (cf. *specialis* M., Ep. x), *specificatus*, *specto*, *sponte*, *stricte* (arg.), *stultum est*, *suasio* (cf. *suadeo* M., Ep. x, etc.), *subadsumo*, *subdo* (arg.), *subinfero* (arg.), *subito*, *subsequens* (arg.), *substantialis* (cf. *substantia* M., V.E., Ep. x, A.T.), *superficialiter*, *superduitas*, *supernaturalis*, *syllogisticus*, *syllogizo* (cf. *syllogismus* M., Ep. iv, A.T., *syllogizator* Ep. v), *tandem*, *tantummodo*, *terminus* (arg.), *testis*, *testimonium* (M., V.E., etc.; cf. *testor* M., V.E., etc.), *theologica*, *theologicus*, *theologus*, *totidem*, *typice*, *typus*, *ultimo*, *ultimum*, *ultimus*, *universitas*, *universalior*, *universalis*, *universalissimus*, *universaliter*, *utinam*, *viciis*, *volitivus*, *volo* (*velle* as noun), *voluntarie*, *voluntas*.

In proportion to its size, there are no more striking evidences of innovation in *M.* than in *V.E.*; but the innovation is of a different kind. Whereas in *V.E.*, as we have seen, Dante strives for the unusual and picturesque, in *M.* he starts with the ordinary vocabulary of the logician, which, according to my theory, he had just been using in *A.T.*, and then greatly develops that. Such a development is obvious from the foregoing lists, and I may further illustrate it by one striking example, — the uses of *patet*. The frequency of this word, in a variety of phrases, must, as Dr. Moore well remarks,¹ impress every reader of the Latin works of Dante. I will try to show also that these phrases form a crescendo.

Dante uses *pateo* in *V.E.* nine times. It is used either absolutely, or governs the infinitive, a *quod* clause, or an indirect question. It is found

¹ *Studies in Dante*, Second Series, p. 348.

in the following set phrases: *Et sic patet*, *Quare . . . patet*, *per quod patet*, *satis etiam patere videtur*, and with *ut*; *ut per inferiora patebit*. Not to notice one occurrence in *Ep.* iv and one in *Ecl.* i, I pass to *Ep.* x, which has seventeen occurrences, a much larger proportion, with the same constructions as in *V.E.* and with set phrases as follows: *Et sic patet* (as in *V.E.*), *Et per hoc patet*, *Propter quod patet*, *Sic ergo patet*, *Patet ergo quomodo*, *Potest amodo patere quomodo*, and with *ut*; *ut patet de*, *ut patet per*. A dative is also used, as *Persaeptius inspicienti patebit*. *A.T.* has the largest proportion of occurrences, thirty-three in all, with the same construction as in *V.E.* and *Ep.* x. For phrases it has *Et sic patet* (*Ep.* x and *V.E.*), *Per quod patet* (as *V.E.*, but nowhere else), *sic igitur patet* (cf. *sic ergo patet* as *Ep.* x), *et quod* and the subjunctive preceding *patet*. Phrases with *ut* are especially cultivated: *ut patet*, *ut infra patebit*, *ut patet ad oculum*, *ut de se patet*, *ut patet per* (as *Ep.* x), *ut patet ex*, *ut patet in*, *ut patet intuenti* (cf. *inspicienti patebit*, *Ep.* x). In *M.* the occurrences for the different books are: i, seventeen times; ii, twelve times; iii, twenty-one times. This is a less number proportionately than for *A.T.*, but the usages are distinctly more varied. Of the constructions that have already appeared we find the following: *et sic patet*, *et per hoc patet*, *propter quod patet*, *sic ergo patet*, *et quod* with the subjunctive preceding *patet*, *ut patet*, *ut patet de*, *ut patet per*, *ut patet ex*, *ut patet in*, *ut patet* with a dative, *ut infra patebit*, *ut de se patet*. Besides these are *patet quia* (as well as *quod*), *patet igitur quod*, *ex quo patet*, *ex iis ergo . . . patet*, *hinc etiam patet*, *et hinc etiam patere potest*. To the *ut* phrases, *ut statim patebit* is added; *sicut patet* appears for the first time, likewise *quod patet*, *quod patet de levi*, *quod de se patet*. Clearly there is a natural development, though not a rigid arithmetical progression, in the use of *pateo* from *V.E.* through *M.* The case is typical of what I am convinced is true of the style of *M.* in general.

Statistics, I would repeat, and especially statistics of stylistic peculiarities, are fraught with danger. They may at least serve as an imperfect symbol of the feeling which I have slowly formed about the works in question. Such a feeling on the part of the calculator of minutiae is to the calculator a most important element in the calculation, though it cannot be communicated directly.¹ From the evidence I have tried to set

¹ Compare what Dr. Moore says on this matter; *Studies in Dante*, Second Series, p. 355.

forth and from more that other readers of the Concordance may detect, I incline strongly to the belief that the chronological order of the four works we have been especially considering was *V.E.*, *Ep. x*, *A.T.*, *M.* Or at least, assuming this order, as some on other grounds have done, we may appeal to stylistic evidence for corroboration. Be that as it may, this evidence is enough to refute once and for all the hypothesis that *Ep. x* and *A.T.* are forgeries; coincidences so numerous and minute could have been vouchsafed a forger only by plenary inspiration, proceeding in this case from the Father of Lies. As that hypothesis fails, it follows as above stated, that *Ep. x* and *A.T.* are genuine works of Dante. The remaining letters are too brief to warrant definite conclusions, but I would state that I have found no certain evidence against the genuineness of any one of them. Various coincidences with peculiarities of the accepted works will be noted in the lists given above. A similar examination of the phraseology of Dante's Italian prose works might yield results of interest.

E. K. RAND